

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US Patent 6,310,874 B1, "Miller") in view of Barkai et al. (US Patent 6,188,691, "Barkai"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and asserts that Miller and Barkai, even if combined, do not teach, disclose, or otherwise suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 9.

Claim 1 reads:

A method for controlling flooding in a bridged network having a bridge connected to a plurality of networks, said method comprising:

- a) allowing broadcast flooding until a mapping of a MAC address to a port is performed by the bridge; and
- b) disallowing broadcast flooding after the mapping is achieved.

Claim 9 of the present application contains similar limitations. In support of the 35 USC 103(a) rejection, Examiner cites Miller, at col. 4, lines 61-66, col. 5, lines 4-6, and Barkai at col. 7, lines 16-18. However, none of these cited references, either by themselves or in combination, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest broadcast flooding until a mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved.

Miller reads, at col. 4, lines 61-66:

The I/O ASIC then initiates a search of the address table to determine if the destination address contained in the header of the received data unit is listed in the address table as indicated by step 52. If the destination address is determined to be in the address table in step 52 then the data unit is transmitted to the destination device or devices as indicated by step 55.

This portion of Miller does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest broadcast flooding until the mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved, which is a major limitation of claims 1 and 9 of the present application.

Miller reads, at col. 5, lines 4-6:

If the data unit is determined not to be a multicast data unit step 54 then the data unit is flooded as indicated by step 56 and flow returns to step 50.

This portion of Miller does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest broadcast flooding until the mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved, which is a major limitation of claims 1 and 9 of the present application.

Barkai reads, at col. 7, lines 16-18:

At this point, all multicast traffic is blocked at each port in the switch, thus preventing the flooding of multicast traffic on all ports on all level 2 devices.

This portion of Barkai does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest broadcast flooding until the mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved, which is a major limitation of claims 1 and 9 of the present application.

Examiner is reminded that claims 1 and 9 do not lay claim in a broadest interpretation to merely performing broadcast flooding and then ceasing broadcast flooding; such actions are performed in combination with a bridge performing mapping of a MAC address to a port. Thus, Miller and Barkai do not teach, disclose, nor otherwise suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 9.

Claims 2-5 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Miller, in view of Barkai, and further in view of Flanders et al. (US patent 6,041,058, "Flanders"). In support of this rejection, it is stated that Miller and Barkai contain all the limitations of parent claims 1 and 9 of the present application. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and refers to the analysis above. Neither Miller, Barkai, nor Flanders disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest, either separately or in combination, performing broadcast flooding until a mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved.

Flanders, at col. 9, lines 2-4, reads:

Protocol Type filters are applied to all MAC, unicast, multicast, and broadcast (bridged and routed) frames, and the Protocol Type filters may be implemented...

Flanders at col. 9, lines 2-4 neither discloses, teaches, nor otherwise suggests performing broadcast flooding until a bridge performs a mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved.

Flanders, at col. 1, lines 25-26, reads:

Such filtering can be employed to improve network operation.

Flanders at col. 1, lines 25-26 neither discloses, teaches, nor otherwise suggests performing broadcast flooding until a bridge performs a mapping of a MAC address to a port is achieved.

Claims 2-5 and 10-13 contain all the limitations of their respective parent claims, namely performing broadcast flooding until a bridge performs mapping of a MAC address to a port. Thus, Flanders, Miller, or Barkai, separately, or in combination, do not teach, disclose, nor otherwise suggest the limitations contained in claims 2-5 and 10-13.

Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims are currently patentable and requests Examiner to place the present application in condition for allowance. If there are any matters the Examiner feels may be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.



John W. Crosby
Reg. No. 49,058

Date: January 6, 2004

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, Nevada 89449
Telephone: (775) 586-9500